# United States District Court

## WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

### **UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

## **ORDER OF DETENTION** PENDING TRIAL

PARIS JAMON MILLER	Case Number:	1:02-CR-210
--------------------	--------------	-------------

PAR	(15 c	JAMON MILLER	0.02-01(-2.10		
require	In ac e the	ccordance with the Bail Reform Act, 18 U.S.C.§314 detention of the defendant pending trial in this ca	2(f), a detention hearing has been held. I conclude that the following facts se.		
		Part I - 1	Findings of Fact		
(1)	(1)	The defendant is charged with an offense des	cribed in 18 U.S.C. §3142(f)(1) and has been convicted of a (federal een a federal offense if a circumstance giving rise to federal jurisdiction had		
		a crime of violence as defined in 18 U.S.C.	§3156(a)(4).		
		an offense for which the maximum senten	·		
		an offense for which the maximum term o	if imprisonment of ten years or more is prescribed in		
		a felony that was committed after the defendu.S.C.§3142(f)(1)(A)-(C), or comparable st	dant had been convicted of two or more prior federal offenses described in 18 ate or local offenses.		
	(2)	The offense described in finding (1) was committed offense.	d while the defendant was on release pending trial for a federal, state or local		
	(3)		nce the (date of conviction) (release of the defendant from imprisonment) for		
	(4)	Findings Nos. (1), (2) and (3) establish a rebuttable assure the safety of (an)other person(s) and the presumption.	(3) establish a rebuttable presumption that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably nother person(s) and the community. I further find that the defendant has not rebutted this		
		Alterna	te Findings (A)		
<u> </u>	(1)	There is probable cause to believe that the defer			
		for which a maximum term of imprisonme under 18 U.S.C.§924(c).	nt of ten years or more is prescribed in		
	(2)	The defendant has not rebutted the presumption	established by finding 1 that no condition or combination of conditions will dant as required and the safety of the community.		
			te Findings (B)		
	(1) (2)	There is a serious risk that the defendant will not	appear. danger the safety of another person or the community.		
	(2)	Following his imprisonment for being a felon in pe	ossession of a firearm, defendant has been before the court on numerous  e. Limiting the history for the purposes of this order to only 2009, it appears		
		that defendant was reincarcerated at the end of F release. Less than two months later, on May 15, work site. No action was taken at that time, but t	February 2009 for a period of two months and put on 24 months' supervised 2009, defendant violated halfway house rules by being absent from his he following month defendant was reincarcerated for six months for		
		-	quently released on December 9, 2009. (continued on attachment) nent of Reasons for Detention		
d that t	he c	redible testimony and information submitted	at the hearing establishes by clear and convincing evidence that		
dentific utstan	atior ding	n to the police on March 20th which allowed has warrants for him during the three months he	or future court proceedings, based upon his providing a false nim to leave the scene, and the fact that there were three had been released since prison. Further, despite defendant's		
eprese	ntati	-	ate Judge Ellen Carmody that (continued on attachment)		
The	dofo		ons Regarding Detention		
etendar r on rec	nt sha quest	all be afforded a reasonable opportunity for private	y General or his designated representative for confinement in a correction aiting or serving sentences or being held in custody pending appeal. The consultation with defense counsel. On order of a court of the United States charge of the corrections facility shall deliver the defendant to the United on with a court proceeding.		
Dated:	Ma	fay 6, 2010	/s/ Hugh W. Brenneman, Jr.		
			Signature of Judicial Officer		
			Hugh W. Brenneman, United States Magistrate Judge		
			Name and Title of Judicial Officer		

United States v. PARIS JAMON MILLER
1:02-CR-210
ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING TRIAL
Page 2.

### **Alternate Findings (B)** - (continued)

Less than four months later defendant is before the court for providing a false identity to a Grand Rapids Police Department officer investigating an automobile crash. Defendant is also charged with being in a bar earlier that evening with his girlfriend. Defendant's girlfriend was found intoxicated at the scene of the accident, unable to answer any questions. Defendant was released because he provided a false identity.

During the period after defendant was released from prison, and prior to March 20, 2010, there were three warrants outstanding for his arrest. Two were for child support and one was for a previous incident of driving while license suspended prior to his last imprisonment. A fourth warrant was issued for providing false information to the police. During this same period defendant was staying with his aunt but did not take the opportunity to clear up any of the existing three warrants.

## Part II - Written Statement of Reasons for Detention - (continued)

"Ms. Jones has been a positive influence on him and she was helping him head down a more positive path" (Supervised Release Violation Report, dated April 20, 2010 at par. 12), in reality this does not appear to have been the case.